



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,669	02/26/2002	Todd A. Newville	09651-012002	3044

26161 7590 07/17/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

SALATA, ANTHONY J

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2837

DATE MAILED: 07/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/083,669	NEWVILLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jonathan Salata	2837	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on th cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 55-73 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,55-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____



UNITED STATES
PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Paper No:12
Serial Number: 10/083669
Filing Date: February 26,2002

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 58,64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 58,64 are directed towards buildings not present in the independent claims.

3. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope.

Art Unit: 2837

The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

4. Claims 1,55-58,60-64,66-69,71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-5,15,16,36,37,46-50,53 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,349,797. This is a double patenting rejection.

In light of the specification, it does not appear that a separate distinct invention is claimed in the instant application. The instant claims merely delete references to the environment (elevator) from 6,349,797. However some of the instant application dependent claims add such references, specifically claims 59,61,64,65,68,70,72,73.

Either specification does not appear to be directed towards any other environment other than an elevator. Thus, both the instant application does not appear to define a separate invention and are considered to be the "same invention".

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 59,65,70 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,36,47 of U.S. Patent No. 6,349,797 in view of DiFranza et al (5,955,710).

Art Unit: 2837

Newville et al (6,349,797) does not claim the occupancy detector and associated control of the advertising.

DiFranza (5,955,710) does not contain a non-source specific first data which contains video category information.

DiFranza does illustrate the occupancy detector for the generation of the building play list to aid in the billing process.

Thus, to utilize an occupancy detector for the control of a play list in elevator advertising would have been an obvious engineering design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6-24-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant states that other options are available for the placement of the display such as lobby.

In light of each specification, no other options other than in the elevator exist although they may be desired by applicant. Each reference to the placement of the device within the instant specification as well as the '797 patent specifically call for an elevator or personnel vehicle. No other options exist.

Thus, the instant invention is not seen as different from the '797 patent by the deletion of references to location.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until

Art Unit: 2837

after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the **status** of this application or **filed papers** should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 2800 via the PTO 2800 Fax Center located at Crystal Plaza 4. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 O.G. 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2800 CP 4 Fax Center Before Final number is (703) 872-9318 or After Final number is (703) 872-9319.

For assistance in Patent procedure, fees or general Patent questions calls should be directed to the Patents Assistance Center (PAC) whose telephone number is 800-786-9199. Assistance is also available on the Internet at www.uspto.gov.

For requesting **Copies** of Cited Art, Office Actions or the like, or General Problem solving, calls should be directed to the TC 2800 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is 703-872-9317 or by fax at 703-872-9317.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Salata whose telephone number is (703) 308-3120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Nappi, can be reached on (703) 308-3370.

ajs
July 15, 2003

JONATHAN SALATA
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2837